

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-4 are pending in the application. In response to the April 7, 2005 Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims define patentable subject matter.

As a preliminary matter, the undersigned thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephone interview conducted on July 19, 2005. Along with this Amendment, Applicant is submitting a Statement of Substance of Interview.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Rangan (USP 6,412,073) in view of Kreiner et al. (USP 6,295,526; hereafter "Kreiner"). Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejection.

Independent claim 1, in part, recites:

said retrieval server of said information retrieval site is configured to retrieve from a plurality of information providing sites data providing detailed information regarding similar services respectively provided by said information providing sites, ... transmit to said information terminal names or address information of said information providing sites and said data providing the detailed information which is retrieved from said retrieval database so as to cause a monitor of said information terminal to simultaneously display said names or address information of said information providing sites and said data providing the detailed information regarding the similar services respectively provided by said information providing sites in a comparative manner for at least two of said information providing sites.

With regard to independent claim 1, the Examiner asserts that “Rangan differs from the claims in that each of the individual listed services are not further annotated with names and/or addresses of the information providing cites.” That is, the Examiner appears to be asserting that the website URLs or hyperlinks (e.g., “LBC.com”) displayed on Rangan’s personalized WEB page correspond to the claimed detailed information regarding similar services provided by the information providing sites.

The Examiner cites Kreiner for allegedly “teach[ing] that in a given directory of information (FIGS. 2D-2E), the names of specific websites for specific service providers can be included (FIG. 2D) along with addresses (URLs or e-mail addresses in upper right corner in FIG. 2E).” Further, the Examiner asserts that it “[i]t would have been obvious ... to modify Rangan to further include specific website addresses and URLs or e-mail to identify addresses so as to provide a user more comprehensive and complete information about a given site as taught by Kreiner et al.”

However, Applicant respectfully submits that the website URLs or hyperlinks (e.g., “LBC.com”) provided on Rangan’s personalized web page are simply names/addresses of information/service providing sites (i.e., the website URLs or hyperlinks correspond to the claimed names or address information of the information providing sites) and do not provide detailed information regarding similar services provided by the information providing sites, as required by claims. Accordingly, Rangan does not disclose displaying both the names/addresses of the information providing sites and the detailed information regarding the similar services

provided by the information providing sites (i.e., Rangan only discloses displaying the names/addresses on the personalized web page).

During the telephone interview, the Examiner cited Kreiner (Fig. 2E) for allegedly providing detailed information regarding services provided by the information providing sites and asserted that it would have been obvious in view of Kreiner to modify Rangan's personalized web page to display detailed information regarding services provided by the information providing sites.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Kreiner does not provide the requisite motivation for modifying the teachings of Rangan to transmit and display in a comparative manner both the names/addresses of the information providing sites and the detailed information regarding the similar services.

Rangan discloses creating, storing and providing to a user personalized web page which includes user names, passwords and URLs. When a user selects a predetermined URL listed on the personalized web page, the personalized web page automatically provides the password and the user name to the Internet destination.

On the other hand, Kreiner discloses a method and system for processing a memory map to provide listing information representing data within a database. Fig. 2D of Kreiner simply illustrates a screen shot of a web browser displaying results of a key word query/search provided by an interactive directory website (i.e., as a result of a key word query/search for "Marriot Hotel" the Bellsouth.com website provides a listing of Marriot Hotels for a particular geographic

area and their address). Fig. 2E of Kreiner simply illustrates a screen shot of the web browser which displays additional (detailed) information for a single selected listing.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Rangan to display in a comparative manner detailed information regarding similar services respectively provided by the information providing sites since the teachings of Kreiner are not related or relevant to Rangan's personalized web page for storing links for accessing password protected sites. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's alleged motivation for modifying Rangan (i.e., "to provide a user more comprehensive and complete information about a given site as taught by Kreiner et al."¹) is improper hindsight reasoning since Rangan's personalized web page is simply concerned with providing a convenient way to list and access user selected sites.

During the interview, the Examiner also asserted that the phrase "to display said names or address information sites ... and said data providing the detailed information regarding the similar services respectively provided by said information providing sites in a comparative manner" does not necessarily require that the names/address and the detailed information regarding similar services for a plurality of information providing sites are displayed on a single web page or at the same time. That is, the Examiner asserted that the phrase "in a comparative manner" could be broadly construed to read on separately displaying the name/address and detailed information of a first information providing site and the name/address and detailed information of a second information providing site on different pages. While Applicant does not

¹ See April 7, 2005 Office Action at page 3.

agree with the Examiner's position in this regard, Applicant has amended claim 1 to improve clarity by reciting that

said retrieval server of said information retrieval site is configured to ... transmit to said information terminal names or address information of said information providing sites and said data providing the detailed information which is retrieved from said retrieval database so as to cause a monitor of said information terminal to simultaneously display said names or address information of said information providing sites and said data providing the detailed information regarding the similar services respectively provided by said information providing sites in a comparative manner for at least two of said information providing sites.²

In other words, the names/addresses and detailed information for a plurality of information providing sites is simultaneously displayed. Although both Rangan and Kreiner disclose simultaneously displaying names and/or addresses (e.g., hotel names and corresponding addresses in Fig. 2B of Kreiner, and URLs or hyperlinks in Fig. 2 of Rangan) of a plurality of information/service providing sites on a single webpage, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose simultaneously displaying the names or address information and data providing the detailed information regarding the similar services respectively provided by the information providing sites in a comparative manner for at least two of the information providing sites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4 should be allowable because the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the features of the

² See, for example, Fig. 2B of the present application.


AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Application No. 09/731,706

claims, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify and combine the cited references to produce the claimed invention.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher R. Lipp
Registration No. 41,157

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 28, 2005